

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 9, 16-18, 20, 21, 23-26, 29, 30, 32, 33, and 37 are pending in the current application, with claims 19, 22, 35, and 38-43 being cancelled by this Amendment. Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 9, 16-26, 29, 30, 32, 33, 35, and 37-43 currently stand rejected, and claims 1, 6, 9, 16, and 18, 20, 21, 24, 26, 29, 30, 32, and 33 have been amended. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections to claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 9, 16-18, 20, 21, 23-26, 29, 30, 32, 33, and 37 are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 9, 16-26, 29, 30, 32, 33, 35, and 37-43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated US Pat 5,884,004 to Sato et al. (“Sato”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the reasons detailed below.

With regard to claim 1, Applicants initially note that the claim has been amended to clarify that the map in the information file includes “at least one entry point for the associated clip file” and **maps “a presentation time stamp to a corresponding source packet address** of the associated clip file.” The VTSPGC information table in Sato contains a sequence of cell playback information blocks for a particular program chain, each block identifying **a start address and presentation time duration** for a corresponding Video Object Unit Cell. See Sato, Col. 21, ll. 22-31. There is no discussion in Sato of the individual blocks indicating time stamps at which a particular source

packet address is to be reproduced; Sato discloses only a duration that a source cell is to be reproduced. Thus, Sato does not teach the map mapping a presentation time stamp to a corresponding source packet address as recited in claim 1 as amended.

Claim 1 has further been amended to clarify that playitems within a playlist file include "identification information indentifying the information file associated with the clip file." The Examiner appears to apply the same cell playback information block as the recited identification information. However, claim 1 recites that the identification information is stored in a playlist file in a playlist directory area, whereas the information file is stored in a management area and contains the above-described map. The blocks in Sato are stored together, and there is no discussion in Sato of a separate identifier outside of the blocks that identifies a file (such as the VTSPGCI) containing the blocks. See Sato, FIG. 16, elements C_PBI#. Thus, Sato further fails to teach the relationship among the playitems, information file, maps therein, and clip files as recited in claim 1 as amended.

Lastly, Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the "**playlist file** stor[es] connection information between a previous **playitem** and a current **playitem**." Sato discloses a seamless connection indicator in the playback information blocks between current and previous VOBUs. See Sato, Col. 21, ll. 32-37. However, as discussed above, these blocks cannot be applied as both the recited maps/information files and the separate playlist file. Nor can VOBUs be applied as previous and current playitems, because the VOBUs are

applied as the recited video data clip files. Thus, Sato fails to disclose a playlist file storing connection information between playitems as recited in claim 1 as amended.

Because Sato fails to teach or suggest each and every element of claim 1 as amended, Sato cannot anticipate or render obvious claim 1. Similarly, claims 1, 16, and 18-21 recite the same unique features of claim 1 discussed above and are thus allowable over Sato at least for reciting these features. Claims 2, 6, 7, 9, 17, 23-26, 29, 30, 32, 33, and 37 are allowable at least for depending from an allowable base claim. Withdrawal of the rejection to claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 9, 16-18, 20, 21, 23-26, 29, 30, 32, 33, and 37 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, in view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the objections and rejections and allowance of each of claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 9, 16-18, 20, 21, 23-26, 29, 30, 32, 33, and 37 in connection with the present application is earnestly solicited.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKEY, & PIERCE, P.L.C.

By



Ryan E. Alley, Reg. No. 60,977
Gary D. Yacura, Reg. No. 35,416
P.O. Box 8910
Reston, Virginia 20195
(703) 668-8000

GDY/REA: tlt